

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

MOHAMMED ABDALLAH OMRAN,)	
)	
PLAINTIFF)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL No. 1:15-cv-190-DBH
)	
PHILIP BLEEZARDE, ET AL.,)	
)	
DEFENDANTS)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING RECOMMENDED DECISION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On August 26, 2016, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the court, with copies to the parties, his Recommended Decision and Order on Pending Motions. The plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommended Decision on September 15, 2016. I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in the Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.¹

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED** as follows:

¹ The first eight motions below are actually subject only to “clearly erroneous” or “contrary to law” review, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), not *de novo* review under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). But I agree with the Magistrate Judge under any standard.

1. The plaintiff's motion to amend his summary judgment motion (ECF No. 124) is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**.

2. The plaintiff's motions to amend his complaint (ECF Nos. 74, 83, 117) are **DENIED**.

3. The plaintiff's motion for an evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 79) is **DENIED**.

4. The plaintiff's motion to compel attendance of deponents (ECF No. 111) is **DENIED**.

5. The plaintiff's motion to compel discovery (ECF No. 112) is **DENIED**.

6. The plaintiff's motion to depose by oral examination (ECF No. 113) is **DENIED**.

7. The plaintiff's motion to strike (ECF No. 115) is **DENIED**.

8. The defendants Bleezarde, Galway, and Clouthier's motion to extend time to object/respond (ECF No. 131) is **GRANTED**.

9. The defendants Bleezarde, Galway, and Clouthier's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 68) on the plaintiff's central Fourth Amendment claim is **GRANTED**.

10. The plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 81) is **DENIED**.

11. The plaintiff's due process and equal protection claims are **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim.

12. The plaintiff's tort claims are **DISMISSED** for want of jurisdiction.

13. The defendants Frichittavong and Noronha's motion to strike the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment against them (ECF No. 84) is **GRANTED**.

14. The plaintiff's motion to hold the federal defendants in contempt of court (ECF No. 80) is **DENIED**.

15. The plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment (ECF No. 116) is **DENIED**.

If I had not adopted the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, I would have granted the federal defendants' motion for sanctions (ECF No. 97) and dismissed the plaintiff's claims against the federal defendants Bleezarde, Clouthier, and Galway, but given my rulings above, that is not necessary.

SO ORDERED.

DATED THIS 27TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2016

/s/D. Brock Hornby
D. BROCK HORNBY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE